



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/767,153	01/29/2004	Jorn Dietrich	60148.0010US01	4630

7590 06/23/2005

Merchant & Gould P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER

ELVE, MARIA ALEXANDRA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1725

DATE MAILED: 06/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/767,153

Applicant(s)

DIETRICH, JORN

Examiner

M. Alexandra Elve

Art Unit

1725

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/8/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: (clm. 1, line 3) "in that in a". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Usui et al. (USPN 4,931,616).

Usui et al. discloses the removal of an insulating coating on a wire using a laser beam. One of the cables used is a flat cable and the laser of choice is CO₂. A clasper is positioned about the cable and the insulation is removed in that region is removed using a laser. The window is precisely defined and multiple window shapes may be chosen. The use of a mechanical stripper and the use of heat are also disclosed. (abstract, figures, col. 1, lines 39-58, col. 2, lines 10-15, 60-65, col. 3, lines 2-3, 50-65, col. 4, lines 39-50, col. 5, lines 1-12)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Usui et al. as stated in the above paragraph and further in view of Hoffa (USPN 5,630,341) and Morino et al. (USPN 4,818,322).

Usui et al. does teach about mechanical stripping but not teach the means of removal or the use of a roller.

Hoffa discloses a method of using cutting blades and subsequently, removing the insulative wire coating (specifically see figures 13 & 18a-18c). (abstract, figures)

Morino et al. discloses the use of roller in laser processing of wire scribed interconnections. During processing a roller (24) or grooved roller (40) may be used to move the wire. (abstract, figures, col. 1 & 3)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a cutting/removal set up, as taught by Hoffa in the Usui et al. processing because of the necessity of removing machining waste during processing.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a roller as taught by Morino et al. in the Usui et al. processing because the enhanced motion and hence removal during processing.

Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Usui et al. as stated in the above paragraph and further in view of Seifert (USPN 3,694,843) and Morino et al.

Usui et al. does teach about mechanical stripping but not teach the means of removal or the use of a roller.

Seifert discloses the use of brushes (18-19), moving in opposite directions, to remove insulation off of different cross sectional types of wires. (abstract, figures, col. 1, lines 7-17, col. 2, lines 64-68)

Morino et al. discloses the use of roller in laser processing of wire scribed interconnections. During processing a roller (24) or grooved roller (40) may be used to move the wire. (abstract, figures, col. 1 & 3)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a brush as taught by Seifert in the Usui et al. processing because of the necessity of removing machining waste during processing.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a roller as taught by Morino et al. in the Usui et al. processing because the enhanced motion and hence removal during processing.

Conclusion


The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See US PTO-892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M. Alexandra Elve whose telephone number is 571-272-1173. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30-3:00 Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Dunn can be reached on 571-272-1171. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

June 21, 2005.


M. Alexandra Elve
Primary Examiner 1725